



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 5  
230 SOUTH DEARBORN ST.  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



172044

153

AUG 14 1991

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:  
5HS

Joseph Adams Jr., P.E.  
Warzyn Engineering, Inc.  
2100 Corporate Drive  
Addison, Illinois 60101

Dear Mr. Adams:

Following is a brief summary of discussions we had in our August 7, 1991, meeting regarding Agency comments on the draft Feasibility Study (FS) for the American Chemical Services Site (ACS). Also attached are comments on the Risk Assessment and the Ecological Assessment.

As agreed in our meeting, a revised FS, addressing all comments, is due on September 6, 1991. Comments on the Risk and Ecological Assessments will be sent to Peter Vagt. Revised Risk and Ecological Assessments will be due on September 16, 1991.

Attendees for 8/7/91 FS meeting held at Region V Offices

Mark Rothas, Warzyn  
Joseph Adams, Warzyn  
John Manley, IDEM  
Robert Swale, USEPA  
Wayde Hartwick, USEPA

The following points were discussed and mutually agreed upon during the meeting:

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Agenda item #1 - Griffith Municipal Landfill

- If the final Baseline Risk Assessment (after USEPA approval) shows a risk then we must go through the decision making process for the landfill.
- An example of a hand-calculated model will be forwarded to Warzyn.
- Depending on the Baseline Risk Assessment, a separate section should be set up in the FS for the landfill.

Item #2 - Optimizing pump & treat

- A discussion will be included in the FS regarding aggressive ground water remediation.
- Treatment capacity issue needs further discussion.

Item #3 - Modification of Alternatives 3 & 6

- In Alternative 3, it will be clearly stated that the removal of VOAs will also take care of the SVOAs.
- Alternative 6 will be expanded to estimate the cost associated with removal of different quantities/risk levels of material. Back calculate the four dominant compounds found in soil borings.

Item #4 - Cost Estimates and Sensitivity Analysis

- Site references and provide one backup sheet of cost estimates for each alternative.
- A sensitivity analysis will be performed.

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

Comment #16

- Suggested language will be added before original language.

Comments #20 & 21

- Will be addressed.

Comment #35

- Will come up with something to address our concern.

Comment #47

- Clarification will be made.

Comment #66

- Clarification that some of the water will be sent to the wetland and some to surface water will be made.

Comment #71

- State issue. IDEM will look into this. The Agency is basically warning Warzyn that they may have to consider this.

Comment #72

- Same as #71.

Comments #81 & 84

- Already discussed.

Comment #86

- Clarification will be made.

Comment #103

- Clarification will be made.

Comment #113

- A discussion will be included.

Comment #133

- It was revealed that the discussed infiltration basin would have to be enormous to accomplish this task. Clarification will be made.

Comment #139

- A discussion will be included.

Comment #143

- As discussed, a better way to handle this concern would be for me to call Mr. Murphy and ask him if he had a problem with any of the alternatives. If he does, he should submit it during the public comment period.

Comment #183


- A clarification will be made to indicate that the protection afforded for alternatives 2-7 is not equivalent.

Tables

- Requested items will be added or removed.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (312) 886-7067.

Sincerely,

  
Wayde M. Hartwick  
Remedial Project Manager

Enclosures

cc: John Manley, IDEM  
Dan Sparks, FWS  
Jim Burton, Roy F. Weston  
Jean Palensky, USACE